

Victor Mota

# **The Social Function of the Philosopher**

A Study of the Social

# 1.

The present text intends to reflect on the social situation, in the Sartrean sense, of the philosopher. I recently discovered, in my inquiries around the city, that the philosopher has a social role, first of all as a conciliator of conflicts, at a first level, and expositor of solutions, directly, between people, without having to read and discuss *ad aeternum* his work in a specialized magazine or in a more or less inaccessible volume. But the reader may ask: does philosophy deal with concrete problems? Now, the question is not posed in these terms, because the situations we live in are not, at all, concrete. They are often eccentric traits, creations of our mind, which takes advantage of its inner strength to shed anger or affection in the face of reality that is others and events. There are few philosophers I know - the same is and applies to sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists - who panic when simply "things fall apart" so you can already tell that they have something "up their sleeve". They all study people, except philosophy, which doesn't just study people, minds, emotions, but other things we'll talk about later. I'm going to tell you a case, or a succession of cases, that happened to me recently.

I came to the conclusion some time ago that the philosopher can even help the police, first of all by softening the conflicts and problems that involve real people in real situations. I had a dispute with a neighbour, an anthropologist, who took me to psychiatric emergencies, taken in a police car during the night to a multi-race and problematic neighborhood. Looks like this one came out in the commission, as an anthropologist... I learned to respect the work of the police, but to understand the reasons, especially among younger people, to steal and commit delinquent acts, I

even realized that the police understand each other in a very distinctive way characteristic of you, dealing with people who are on the margins of society, if only because I myself lived, although in a good house, *the margin*, in sociological terms, because I don't have a car, job, girlfriend. The personal identity of the philosopher is something of that we want to circumscribe in this essay, to whom the much broader problematic of personal identity in a certain sense in the history of philosophy, since this is something that concerns the path, biography, of the individual, far beyond the virtuality and asymmetries of an affective life. We are thus within a clearly Platonic framework, which we could equate with the following title formulation: The search for solitude: the myth of the Cave revisited. Our idea is that the inhabitants of the *Caverna* are logically and hermeneutically equivalent to the inhabitants of the caver, probably because they retain within them the images of a repetitive working day, going out only to work and eat, to have fun, for leisure purposes; when in desire to be accompanied, profoundly, but perhaps they are more alone than they believe, living on these more or less parsimonious and violent, but undoubtedly impersonal, images of the street, the outside, the world, thus creating a world, their world, that replicates them in more or less beneficial writings and entertainments. The philosopher, more than the anthropologist, can announce tomorrow's world today, in the infinite possibilities of *good radiations* who sit between two or more people. How do we respect the people, we respect religion, which is not just *re-connect* to the divine, causing heaven to rise nowadays, but respectful adoration for the other, for the others who created God, that supra social entity, it is respect for what others feel. the philosopher, like the policeman, he anticipates loneliness, suffering, desire, aggression, but does nothing to combat it. Like the anthropologist. Hence the need for a new strain of the two species, the anthropophilosopher, the ethnophilosopher, pop-

philosopher, as I would say, coming from philosophical anthropology, which, on the side of anthropology, is the philosophical study of material culture, and for the philosopher, the philosophical study of the theme of materiality. In certain contexts, especially among the younger ones, the philosopher is worthy of being seen as a being at the same time illuminated and out of this world (aka: crazy). Perhaps this double attribution will bring you a lot of displeasure. res within the scope of your image before the others, however, among their teacher peers, it is not the same anymore, so we can infer from this displacement generational a gift to see beyond the present what comes to pay in terms of its social image, if we compare with other professions, where the immediate and the contingent matter more than the *The End* of things, the purpose of **Existenz**.

Thus, philosophy is seen with a mixture of distrust and admiration, the philosopher is not normally apt for practical things, when we know that his work is insistently practical, the work of concepts, fixing concepts as he receives the influx of reality, social or world data (mundane). He is thus a profane priest, a creator, a duplicator of the work of others, the best known, while silently working towards the recognition of himself. Even so, it applies the work of its mind, knowing that he can no longer, after a certain point, separate the mind from the body, on pain of being alone in the world. However, it may be pertinent to see the philosopher as being sensitive to the world, perhaps too sensitive, to the point of taking refuge in the world of himself, in his world, at the moment when he fears being swallowed by the vortex of world events, thus being perhaps a secular priest, a secular priest who makes doubt the crucible of his dreams and his work, as if it were also a lightning rod for the bad moments of society, foreseeing cataclysms and letting live in tolerance all that there is to be lived around him and appearing in bad times to cheer his fellows and fellow countrymen with delight, knowing, however, that the

good philosopher has neither land nor master, that the good philosopher is what makes suffering and inner lack into good texts, a social and social text. of social use. Thus, the philosopher's role can be either in the company or among a band of beggars or criminals, for or against the law, because the law is not always written in straight lines. The good philosopher is not one who prepares for death, in the Kierkegaardian sense, but one who prepares and lives happiness, in the Russellian sense, because happiness can both be given and conquered, and once conquered, it can hardly be taken away. Likewise, Eduardo Lourenço can be seen as the most reactionary of Portuguese authors, who seeks to see some sense in Portugal when, in my view, it has no meaning and therein lies its anthropological richness. But what is there beyond the philosopher's mentality and the real, that real that escapes him but from which he knows the structures, whether metallic or social. We thus enter the domain of a no man's land, where the event is no longer the appearance of man, but the technology of technology, not so much knowledge as knowing how to do it. It is a great challenge for the Good. The philosopher is a beggar of knowledge, a Franciscan, who deals with images to transforming them into words, concepts, he makes an intellectual "bricolage" over the event, a prophylaxis of the apocalyptic terror that overshadows the days of contemporary man. Perhaps the philosopher needs to know more about emotions, about feelings, about anthropology, probably starting from fieldwork, the philosophy of experience is the only valid and possible philosophy. The Greek Polis had no police, but they had an army. Nowadays, the police may be the only effective means of governance of a city, a city where sometimes, in a democracy, the citizen goes beyond the limits of ethics. Even if it seems old-fashioned, being Catholic or Orthodox can seem like a certain form of dogmatism, but those who are rigid are always rigid for some reason, whether for themselves or for the Other who is close

to them. In this sense, it is necessary to recover a philosophy of truth from Lévinas. Thus, between the myth of the context and the pure and hard universality, it is necessary to conceive a contextualized universality, that is, a human action or thought that corresponds to the variations in the ways of being and feeling that the writer calls, in his transhumance of knowledge , as I spoke in times, literature, travel, particularly.

## 2.

The philosopher, employee of humanity? To the detriment of their social consideration, certainly, of their social representation, because from anthropologists the general public has more respect, but from philosophers too, but behind their backs they conspire against them, as if they were guilty of their crimes of, for example, violence. domestic work, as if they hadn't had the courage to study philosophy and had studied management, economics, law, sociology. Society lives on excess and digs its intellectual legitimacy in the philosopher, that is, while the latter remains thinner and more depressed, the rest of society grows fatter and euphoric, prone to all kinds of vices and licentiousness. But, in spite of everything, I am convinced that the philosopher has a social function, not if he is a philosopher by chance, it is necessary a thought, a maturation. I argue that, from the point of view of the anthropologist, the philosopher, his function, aims to counterbalance certain losses in social terms, that is, while everyone goes in a certain direction, that of the moment, that of common sense, he goes in another direction. direction, perhaps in the opposite direction and this generates a sense of balance and it is not only in terms of the sums of the subjects, it is because the philosopher also thinks about society. He has a bit of what Bourdieu called "symbolic power", but also a bit of the philosopher-king of Plato, at the same time as the scapegoat mentioned by Luc de Heush and René Girard. The anthropologist, like the philosopher, also allows migrants to be around, takes care of them, defends them in the face of certain radical tendencies, on the left and on the right, and supports them without hesitation within a national context and, in fact, the

context, society, is the nation-state, because it is equivalent to a common language...

# 3.

On the other hand, I understand why some philosophers prefer the academy to the real world, being that gym is like a virtual world. It's just that there's no comfort on the street and everyone talks, walks astray, which explains why psychiatric hospitals are crammed with people with heavy consciences and/or problems with violence, domestic and so on...

But, even so, nobody cares about the philosopher or the anthropologist, they recognize a certain knowledge, which in the resolution of human problems in particular, or in general theories, about society, the world, the universe of humans relationships. When the first Portuguese goes into space, there are still so many (human) problems to be solved, when the Churches are empty and few young people appear there, at Mass or to pray in the middle of the afternoon, struggle with conscience, with the idea of welfare. Because there are many people who have a conflict between flesh and spirit, some are on the side of the spirit, because the flesh no longer gives, others are on the side of the flesh and use it until they give and only then go to church. There is no middle ground, which is why I have always defended that Portuguese society is bipolar. Like others, by the way. This is valid for subjects and groups, that is, for the individual and the collective, national, that is to say. Curious, everyone's evil, sociologists, anthropologists, philosophers, they all want a territory, while they preach global understanding between peoples... Then the priest appears, philosopher of the sacred, everyone ostracizes him, doesn't ask for his services, doesn't help him punctually for him to eat, nor do they put the coin in there for the saint or for his conscience, but when they are in

the end, they realize that, between salvation and having sold one's soul to the devil (of knowledge), there is a short or long distance, some allow themselves to be walked by the senses, others allow themselves to be walked by the divine God, but little have the ability to be in the middle, as Cicero and Seneca would say...

My preposition, thesis, may seem unhappy, or functionalist, meager, but I advance as soon as it reaches my mind, I don't stop either once or again, questioning everything, even suspending the truth of the morning, among the seagulls of the Tejo and the pigeons of the Oriente station, I persist because the philosopher needs a little social theory, just as the social scientist needs a little philosophy, more or less radical questioning, doubt, suspension of judgment, better, a certain moralism, morality or morality, which the philosopher can have in addition, that is, while one is libidinous, the other is chaste, better, anarchic, as Michel Onfray could refer...

## CONCLUSION

Many give the chair a symbolic power to the philosopher. And he abuses it, he is not fully aware of his social representation and that is where the anthropologist comes in, helping him in his dementia of knowledge, disconnected from the body, from the pleasures of the body, analyzing its social role as a balancer of human relationships. Alongside the priest, the philosopher needs social concepts and to uproot a certain moral, preserved, or just live with it, live with it...

The priest, having studied psychological sciences, can help not only those who feel afflicted, but those who realize this *affliction* (in the sense of *affliction*) of today's times, while some rush into the vortex of time, of the moment, others are left to reflect, for them, because we have to be for each other, while some want more and more, others just want what they get, what pleases them, what God gives them. Strange, a Marxist anthropologist is insisting on the idea of a god who can do everything, because most subjects want to be that God, while others call him Lord...

In the "Introduction to Social Anthropology" classes, Raúl Iturra confessed, after the weariness of the mind of someone who has a gift, pain, and on top of that makes an effort, that the anthropologist is schizophrenic. Yes, perhaps it is, but he is happy in his pursuit, while society, or some elements of society, continue to insist on a behavioral rhetoric of the *mainstream*, that is, in the violence of machismo, in a certain way of being a totally stereotyped man. But many women promote this vision...then, they want to have their rights recognized, abortion, domestic violence, drugs, etc, etc...I believe that the anthropologist is always, in his social role, on the side of the poorest, the most afflicted, while the philosopher burns

with the lack of tools because he thinks his head is a laboratory and that he can conceive everything, the Whole, the Totality (Lévinas), without asking the Other's opinion, of trying to know what he thinks, what he, in a sensitive world, experiences through sensations. The human sciences are too powerless to always keep themselves apart and that it is not just the anthropologist doing everything, taking the first epistemological step, and continuing, following in the lead, as a leader. It is necessary for the philosopher to face a certain concreteness of social life and be aware of his pivotal role, because he is a new platform to balance social tensions and impulses, before psychiatry... before a more or less philosophical anthropology...

**Lisbon, August 04, 2022**

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

BOURDIEU, Pierre, *The Symbolic Power*

MAFFESOLI, Claudio, *Homo Sacer*

GIRARD, Rene, *Des Choses Cachees*

ELIAS, NORBERT, *The Discovery of Intimacy*

CONNERTON, Paul, *How do societiesthink*

DOUGLAS, Mary, *How Institutions Think*

FOUCAULT, Michel, *The Psychiatric Power*

GOFFMAN, Erving, *Asylumsand The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*

PIRES AURÉLIO, Diogo, *Machiavelli & Heirs*

ECO, Umberto, *Apocalyptic and Integrated, The Name of the Rose, Foucault's Pendulum*

DANTE, Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy (original andacademic works)*

ONFRAY, Michel, *Le Désir d'Être un Volcain and La Puissance d'Éxister*

MARCUSE, Herbert, *A Study on Anthority*

DE HEUSH, Luc, *Le Bouc Émissaire*

HERTZ, Robert, *La Prémenece de la Main Droite*

HEMINGWAY, Ernest, *The Old Man and the Sea*

LÉVINAS; Emmanuel, *Totalidade e Infinito*

LOURENÇO, Eduardo, *Labirinto da Saudade*

TURNER, Victor, *Drumms of Affliction*